

REMARKS

Claims 1, 10, 30 and 39 have been amended. New claim 43 has been added. Thus, claims 1, 4-10, 13-18, 21, 22, 30, 31, 39, 40 and 43 are now pending in the application. Support for the amendment to claim 1 may be found in the specification at page 21, line 20, to page 25, line 15. Support for the amendments to claims 30 and 39 may be found in the specification at page 45, last paragraph, and the paragraph bridging pages 46 and 47. Support for new claim 43 may be found in original claims 1 and 10. Thus, no new matter has been added. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the present rejections in view of the amendments and comments presented herein are respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph based upon recitation of "[a] method of synthesis of the component (A) of claim 1..." The Examiner states that the scope of claim 10 is indefinite since it is a method claim, while claim 1 from which it depends is a composition claim. Claim 10 has been amended to recite the language suggested by the Examiner and is no longer a method claim.

Claims 15 and 16 were rejected as being indefinite. The component (A1) comprises a unit (A1') derived from (α -methyl)hydroxystyrene represented by the formula (I'). In this formula, R is an H atom or a methyl group. The Examiner states that for (α -methyl)hydroxystyrene, R has to be a methyl group. However, the present specification at page 39, lines 11-12 defines (α -methyl)hydroxystyrene as either or both of hydroxystyrene ($R=H$) and α -methylhydroxystyrene ($R=CH_3$). Thus, the claims are not indefinite.

In view of the comments provided above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 4-10, 13, 14, 30, 31, 39 and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bantu et al. (US 6,072,006). The Examiner stated that if claims 1, 39 and 40 were amended to recite that the component (B1) is a poly(bissulfonyl)diazomethane photoacid generator, that the rejection would be overcome. Claims 39 and 40 have been amended to recite the language stated by the Examiner. Thus, claims 39 and 40 should now be allowable.

Claim 1 as amended recites other components that are neither disclosed nor suggested by Bantu, specifically a compound represented by the formulas (ii)-(vi). Thus, claims 1, 4-10, 13-18, 21, 22, 30 and 31 cannot be obvious over this reference.

New claim 43 (last line) recites that the resin is synthesized "in the substantial absence of an acid catalyst." In contrast, the resin of Bantu et al. is synthesized "in the presence of an acid catalyst." (See column 2, lines 53-55). Because Bantu et al. teach resin synthesis in the presence of an acid catalyst, this cannot render obvious new claim 43 which teaches in the opposite direction, namely resin synthesis in the substantial absence of an acid catalyst.

In view of the claim amendment, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Allowance of the claims at an early date is solicited. If any points remain that can be resolved by telephone, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-given telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 6/5/07

By: 

Neil S. Bartfield, Ph.D.
Registration No. 39,901
Agent of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(619) 235-8550